

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8

* * *

9

10 JANIE ALINE PINKNEY,) Case No.: 2:08-cv-01257-RLH-GWF
11)
12 Plaintiff,) O R D E R
13 vs.) (Motion for Leave to File Excess
14 AMERICAN MEDICAL RESPONSE, INC.,) Pages-#351)
15 EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES,)
16 MERCY, INC., SOUTHERN NEVADA)
17 HEALTH DISTRICT, MEDICAL ADVISORY)
18 BOARD, EMERGENCY MEDICAL)
19 SERVICES AND TRAUMA SYSTEMS, SEIU)
20 NEVADA, ROY CARROLL, WILLIAM)
21 (BILL) SANGER, KURT WILLIAMS,)
22 ROBERT FORBUS (AKA FORBES), EDWIN)
23 FLIP" HOMANSKY, RICHARD MANN,)
24 DEREK COX, MARIZA LANDEROS, BEDE)
25 PARRY, JENNIFER HALL, MARJORIE)
26 BARBEAU, MAURICE KAY, ALFREDO)
CERVANTES, ERIC PAUL, GREGORY)
CLEMMONS, CHRIS HUGHES, JASON)
TEAGUE, JASON EDELL, "BJ" KOPKA,)
AMY POTTS, STEVE KRAMER, CARRIE)
FOX, BRAD CAMPBELL, GRAHAM)
JAMIESON, JAMES (BUD) ADAMS, KAREN)
REPOS, RORY CHETELAT, MARY ELLEN)
BRITT, PATRICIA BECKWITH, and)
STEPHEN MINIGIL)
Defendants.)

1

2

Before the Court is Plaintiff Jaine Aline Pinkney's **Motion for Leave to File Excess Pages** (#351), filed December 22, 2010. The Court has also considered Defendants Rory Chetelat and Stephen Minagil's Opposition (#355), filed January 7, 2011, and Pinkney's Reply (#357), filed January 14, 2011.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

This dispute arises from Pinkney's allegations that Defendants conspired to violate her civil rights and discriminate against her. Pinkney filed her original complaint on September 19, 2008. Two motions for summary judgment have now been filed, one by Defendant American Medical Response, Inc., and the other by Defendants Chetelat and Minagil. Pinkney filed an opposition to both of these motions, each opposition consisting of points and authorities exceeding 100 pages. However, Pinkney filed those oppositions without first seeking leave of the Court to file excess pages. Pinkney, therefore, seeks such leave retroactively.

Pursuant to Local Rule 7-4, "pretrial and post-trial briefs and points and authorities in support of, or in response to, motions shall be limited to thirty (30) pages including the motion but excluding exhibits." The decision to extend the 30-page limitation is an equitable one vested in the discretionary power of this Court. As mentioned above, Pinkney's oppositions to Defendants' motions for summary judgment each consisted of points and authorities exceeding 100 pages. "The order to General Eisenhower to invade the entire continent of Europe consisted of a single paragraph. It would be unusual if the grounds for [an opposition to a motion for summary judgment] could not be set out in 30 pages." *Gulf Petro Trading Co. v. Nigerian National Petroleum*, 233 F.R.D. 492, 493 (E.D. Tex. 2005). Furthermore, the filing of excess pages infringes upon the Courts ability to timely manage its docket and impedes judicial efficiency. Therefore, the Court denies Pinkney's motion, strikes her oppositions (#337 and 349), and orders her to re-file her oppositions pursuant to the 30-page limitation of LR 7-4 by Tuesday, February 1, 2011.

/

1 Accordingly, and for good cause appearing,


2 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Pinkney's Motion for Leave to File Excess Pages
3 (#351) is DENIED.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Pinkney must re-file an opposition to
5 Defendants' motions for summary judgment (## 331 and 334) pursuant to the limitations of Local
6 Rule 7-4 by Tuesday, February 1, 2011. Defendants will have one week from the time Pinkney
7 re-files her oppositions within which they can file a reply.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the following documents are stricken in their
9 entirety:

10 • Response to Motion for Summary Judgment (#337)
11 • Response to Motion for Summary Judgment (#349)
12 • Reply to Response to Motion for Summary Judgment (#347)
13 • Reply to Response to Motion for Summary Judgment (#348)
14 • Reply to Response to Motion for Summary Judgment (#356)

15 Dated: January 18, 2011


16 ROGER L. HUNT
17 Chief United States District Judge